

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 37 remain active in this application. Claims 1, 17 and 28 have been amended to emphasize the architectural/hierarchical levels of lists and the logical interpositioning of the list of access profiles among the levels of other recited lists already implicit in the claims. Verbatim support for the amendments of the claims is found throughout the application, particularly in Figure 1A and the description thereof on pages 13 and 14. No new matter has been introduced into the application. The indication of allowability of claims 13, 14, 21, 34 and 35 is noted with appreciation.

Claims 1 - 12, 15 - 20, 22 - 33 and 36 - 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Ahlberg et al. This sole ground of rejection in this application is respectfully traversed for the reasons of record and particularly as being moot in view of the amendments made above.

It has been previously pointed out that each independent claim, as presently rejected, recites 1.) a list of resources (e.g. Figure 15) to which users may have access, if authorized, 2.) a list of access profiles (e.g. Figure 14) wherein each access profile contains at least one of the resources contained in the list of resources and which will generally be groups of resources, and 3.) a list of users (e.g. Figure 13) which includes, for each user, a security profile by which each user can be authenticated to the system and one or more access profiles contained in the list of access profiles. In other words, the invention provides a list of access profiles logically interposed between the list of users with its security profiles for respective users and the list of resources available through the system. This logical architecture and hierarchy of lists illustrated in

Figure 1A, by providing an intermediate level list of access profiles (indicated by reference numeral 14 in Figure 1A) avoids the necessity of providing any reference to users in the list of resources (or the resources themselves) or in the list of access profiles or any reference to individual resources, *per se*, in the list of users which supports automatic updating of the lists and access authorizations from simple editing of either the list of resources or the list of users when either resources or users are added, deleted or substituted, provides convenience in adding or deleting authorizations or modification of a security profile for a given existing user (some features of which the Examiner has now found to be allowable) and single operation authentication of a user for all of the resources to which the user is provided with authorized access, including, as a perfecting feature of the invention, provision for resolution of the type (e.g. read only, read and write) of authorization granted for each resource.

While Ahlberg et al. contains references to numerous "profiles", no teaching (or suggestion) of any such hierarchy or ordered levels of lists and the relationship of their respective contents is seen and the Figures now noted by the Examiner and the passages of Ahlberg et al. descriptive thereof appear to be devoid of any reference to such subject matter or anything of relevance thereto. Moreover, the passage descriptive of Figure 20 at column 16, lines 33 - 65, appears to indicate that particular applications (e.g. resources) are directly associated with users and their security profiles in the user profiles of Ahlberg et al.; directly contrary to the ordering of lists and the relationship of their contents recited in the claims (e.g. an list of profiles interposed between a list of users and a list of resources for associating users with resources would serve no useful purpose if that

association is made directly in user profiles which would also preclude development of the advantages of the invention in facilitating changes of authorizations and authentication information provided by the invention). Accordingly, these further references to Ahlberg et al. do not mitigate the Examiner's failure to make a *prima facie* demonstration of anticipation (or obviousness) of any claim while these features support many meritorious effects not realized by Ahlberg et al.

In the present office action, the Examiner does not indicate any particular passages in Ahlberg et al. which the Examiner believes to answer the particular relationships and interactions between the lists of users, access profiles and resources but only passages relating to profiles (used for entirely different purposes, user lists and resource lists individually or directly between the user and resource lists and, moreover, mentions only the lack of explicit recitation of a hierarchy and interposition of the access profile list between the user list and the resource list as justification for adhering to the ground of rejection based on Ahlberg et al. Further, the Examiner explicitly suggests inclusion of such recitations to expedite the prosecution. Accordingly, while it is again respectfully submitted that the claims, as rejected, are fully and patentably distinguished from Ahlberg et al. particularly under 35 U.S.C. §102, in an effort to satisfy the Examiner, an explicit recitation of the logical levels of the system and the logical placement of the access profile list between the levels of the user list and the resource list has been added to each of independent claims 1, 17 and 28. The words "hierarchy" and "interposition" do not appear verbatim in the specification although such words are certainly descriptive of at least Figure 1A and language is employed in the above amendments for which there is verbatim as well as substantive support in the

specification. If the Examiner prefers the terminology indicated, Applicant is certainly amenable to discussing an Examiner's Amendment to employ such terminology.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the sole ground of rejection in this application is clearly untenable in regard to any claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 - 12, 15 - 20, 22 - 33 and 36 - 37 remains in error and untenable and should be withdrawn in regard to these claims as it has been in regard to claims 13, 14, 21, 34 and 35 and such action is respectfully requested.

Since all rejections, objections and requirements contained in the outstanding official action have been fully answered and shown to be in error and/or inapplicable to the present claims, it is respectfully submitted that reconsideration is now in order under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) and such reconsideration is respectfully requested. Upon reconsideration, it is also respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is therefore respectfully requested.

If an extension of time is required for this response to be considered as being timely filed, a conditional petition is hereby made for such extension of time. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to International Business Machines Corporation deposit account 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,



Marshall M. Curtis
Reg. No. 33,138

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P. C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, Virginia 20190
(703) 787-9400
Customer Number: 30743